DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 432 539 SP 038 651

AUTHOR Thompson, Marceline
TITLE The Relationship of Students' Affinity for Teacher to Students' Perceptions of Teacher's Power: A Report on the Preliminary Developments of Two New Instruments.
PUB DATE 1998-07-00
NOTE 27p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; College Students; Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; *Power Structure; *Student Attitudes; *Teacher Student Relationship; Test Construction; Test Reliability; *Test Validity

ABSTRACT

This study tested the validity and reliability of a survey instrument designed to measure students' perceptions of teacher's power and students' affinity for a teacher. Respondents were 30 students enrolled in two basic communication courses at a midsize public university. The researcher distributed a survey that contained measures of affinity and power. Respondents took the survey home and returned it the following class period. The survey included three sections that examined students' perception of teacher power, students' affinity for the teacher, and demographics. Data analysis indicated that students' affinity for the teacher related to their perception of the teacher's power. Based on the statistics, the study indicated that the survey instrument was readable and useful. Because the pilot study found the survey usable, a sample size was calculated for use in a formal study to gather norming data for the instrument. In an effort to obtain norming data for the instrument, the survey would be administered to students taking a core course at several different colleges. The summary instrument is included. (Contains 19 references.) (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SP

Running Head: THE RELATIONSHIP OF STUDENTS' AFFINITY

ED 432 539

The Relationship of Students' Affinity for Teacher to Students' Perceptions of Teacher's Power: A Report on the Preliminary Developments of Two New Instruments

Marceline Thompson

University of Memphis

SP038651

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Thompson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

The Relationship of Students' Affinity for Teacher to Students' Perceptions of Teacher's Power: A Report on the Preliminary Development of a Two New Instruments

Introduction

No matter how much a teacher encourages students to take charge of their own learning and encourages autonomy in students, teachers need to be seen as having power. As Kearney, Plax, Richmond and McCroskey (1985) point out, teachers need to be seen as having power "potential" and must be able to "implement" that potential. Without this power potential, teachers could not initiate and maintain students' on-task behavior and deal with disruptions.

Research on power in the classroom has focused on both power potential and specific ways of implementing that potential. Specifically, studies have linked students' perceptions of power potential to French and Raven's (1968) five power bases (Kearney, Plax, Richmond, McCroskey, 1985; McCroskey & Richmond, 1983; Richmond & McCroskey, 1984). Strategies for implementing power have primarily focused on Behavior Alteration Techniques (BATs) (Kearney, Plax, Richmond, & McCroskey, 1984, 1985; McCroskey, Richmond, Plax, & Kearney, 1985). These BATS are specific influence strategies that teachers can use to manage student behavior. (Each BAT best represented by a Behavior Alteration Message).

This paper seeks to expand the focus of classroom influence research to include the concept of affinity as a means to influence students. Affinity can be conceptualized as a feeling of positive regard (liking) for another person. The process by which individuals attempt to get others to like them has been termed affinity-seeking. Bell and Daly (1984) developed a typology of 25 affinity-seeking strategies that individuals use to get others to like them. This typology includes strategies such as, *dynamism*, *supportiveness*, *present interesting self*, etc. (Bell & Daly, 1984).

Although this typology was created for the interpersonal context, it has been shown to valid in the classroom (McCroskey and McCroskey, 1986). Student affinity for the teacher has been shown to have numerous classroom benefits such as enhanced perceptions of teacher credibility (Frymier & Thompson, 1992), increased student motivation to learn, and increased cognitive and affective learning (Richmond, 1992).

Daly and Kreiser (1992) linked the 25 affinity seeking strategies to student perceptions of teacher's referent power. French and Raven (1968), identified referent power as power based on

the identification or relationship between two people. A person with high referent power is able to influence others because others like and identify with them. In the classroom setting then, a teacher with high referent power is one that students like and want to please. Daly and Kreiser observed that, "Of all the bases of classroom power, referent power is the closest to affinity as an influence strategy" (p. 138). Further, they commented: We know that it is possible to conceive of the various affinity strategies as ways of operationalizing referent power. But we know little about how the different techniques actually lead to greater influence in the classroom" (p. 142). Although these statements make intuitive sense, the authors provided no evidence to support them. High affinity may not equal power. It is possible to like someone without perceiving them as powerful. Therefore, it could be possible to like an instructor without perceiving him/her as a source of referent power. For example, a student may like a young teaching assistant but may not respect the person and may fail to regard him/her as powerful. Also, perhaps liking for an instructor only equals referent power if students perceive power from one of the previously discussed bases of power such as, legitimate or expert power. The potential relationship between a teacher's affinity and the power bases has not been studied empirically. The present paper undertakes a complete review of relevant literature on the concepts of power in the classroom and affinity in the classroom. In addition, this paper presents the results of a pilot study that was conducted to empirically measure students' perceptions of their teachers power and students' affinity for their teacher.

Review of the Literature

Power in the Classroom

McCroskey and Richmond's (1983) article, *Power in the Classroom I: Teacher and Student Perceptions*, was the first in a series of articles dealing with power in the classroom. The purpose of the series on power in the classroom was to discover how a teacher's power affects students' learning and how teachers can use their power to facilitate student learning.
The main focus of this introductory article was to determine the degree to which students and teachers have shared perceptions of power in the classroom and to develop an acceptable way of measuring power in the classroom. The degree of shared perceptions of power has a strong impact on student-teacher communication. A student who recognizes the teacher's power can respond appropriately to it, even if he/she doesn't like it. Conversely, a student who can not recognize a

teacher's power is more likely to respond inappropriately to it. McCroskey and Richmond (1983) concluded that, once the degree of shared perceptions is known, students and teachers can be taught what kinds of power influence outcomes like learning.

McCroskey and Richmond (1983) discussed two views of power in the classroom. The first is a narrow view provided by Hurt, et al. (1978). Hurt wrote (as cited by McCroskey and Richmond), "Power refers to a teacher's ability to affect in some way the student's well-being beyond the student's own control" (p. 124). McCroskey and Richmond (1983) took issue with this view since it "suggests an absence of intellectual assent to influence on the part of the student" (p. 176). However, that they noted that this view of power is prevalent among in-service teachers in workshops and seminars. The second definition of power that McCroskey and Richmond (1983) discussed is a broader one that refers to,

> an individuals *potential* to have an effect on another person's or group of person's behavior. . .this broader view sees power as the capacity to influence another person to do something he/she would not have done had he/she not been influenced (p. 176).

McCroskey and Richmond (1983) note that French and Raven (1968) subscribe to the definition of power but note that the change in behavior/attitude, etc., must be the result of another's influence and not a combination of other factors which may have exerted spurious influence. Given this view of the nature of power, French and Raven (1968) identified five bases of power: coercive, reward, legitimate, referent, and expert. McCroskey and Richmond (1983) based their study on French and Raven's (1968) conceptualization of power and adapted the power bases (originally part of the organizational context) to the instructional context.

Coercive power is based on the student's perceptions that he or she will be punished if he or she does not comply with the instructor. The strength of coercive power lies in the students expectations of how probable it is that the teacher will enact punishment and how severe the punishment will be minus the probability of punishment from other sources, such as peers.

Reward power is based on the student's perception of the likelihood receiving rewards for compliance. The strength of reward power is affected by the student's perception of rewards from other sources for noncompliance.

Legitimate power, also called "assigned power," is based on the student's perception that a teacher has the right to make certain demands because of his or her position as "teacher."

Legitimate power is usually related to matters such as controlling class time, what unit should be studied, regulating interaction, etc.

Referent power refers to the strength of the student-teacher relationship. The foundation of this type of power is a student's identification with the teacher. The stronger the student's identification with the teacher, the stronger the referent power.

Expert power is based on student's perceptions of how knowledgeable and competent the teacher is. Most course information is presented from an expert power base. Ideas are presented to students with the expectation that they will be accepted. The main impact of expert power is the ability to change student's cognitions.

As stated previously, a main goal of the McCroskey and Richmond (1983) study was to find an acceptable way of measuring power in the classroom. McCroskey and Richmond (1983) used two measures of power: the perceived power measure (PPM) and the relative power measure (RPM). The PPM was originally developed to assess the relationships among the power bases, employee satisfaction and management communication style (Richmond, 1982). It was adapted by McCroskey and Richmond (1983). Subjects were first provided with descriptions of the power bases, then, were asked to respond to one of the following statements: I use _____ power (if subjects were teachers), or, "My teacher uses _____ power" (if the subjects were students). The second measure of power, the RPM, also explains the power bases, but asks subjects to divide percent among the various types of power to estimate their actual usage of each base. For example, if one used almost exclusively reward power, and a little expert power, one might indicate that he/she uses 80 percent reward power and 20 percent expert power. These two instruments provided an operationalization of relative power use for McCroskey and Richmond's (1983) study.

The second goal of McCroskey and Richmond's (1983) study was to use that instrument to determine student and teachers shared perceptions of the use of power in the classroom. To this end, the authors sampled 156 teachers and 2,698 students from seventh grade through colege.

The results indicated that students and teachers shared similar perceptions of teachers' power use. Students and teachers reported that reward, referent and expert power were used more than coercive or legitimate. However, students did not believe that teachers used as much expert power as teachers thought they did and students perceived teachers as using more coercive power

than teachers thought they did. These results were preliminary, but provided a basis for study II in the series.

McCroskey and Richmond (1984), in their article *Power in the Classroom II: Power and learning*, continued the series on power in the classroom by examining how a student's perceptions of teacher's use of power affects both affective and cognitive learning. Again, they defined power as, "an individual's capacity to influence another person to do something he/she would not have done has he/she not been influenced." They used the power bases (French and Raven, 1968) discussed in the their first article to measure power. They concluded that both coercive and legitimate power inhibit cognitive and affective learning, while referent and expert power enhance cognitive and affective learning. Reward power neither enhances or inhibits learning. They concluded that teachers thus may use reward power to establish referent and expert power, both of which will enhance learning.

The next article in the series on power in the classroom, (Kearney, Plax, Richmond, & McCroskey, 1985), entitled *Power in the Classroom III: Teacher Communication Techniques and Messages*, however, shifted away from an emphasis on power to focus on specific techniques teachers can use to implement that potential. Thus, the third article focused on control strategies. In particular, the research sought to extend the existing typology of "behavior alteration techniques" (BATs). BATs are grounded in operant conditioning and include strategies such as the use of reinforcement, time-outs, and behavioral contracts.

The goals of the study were threefold: First, to discover what techniques teachers frequently use to effectively for control behavior in the classroom; second, to find out if teachers perceive students as using similar and effective techniques on them; and third, to discover if both teachers' choice and effectiveness of specific techniques were related to instructors' gender, number of years teaching, grade level taught, or teacher's satisfaction with teaching.

In order to find specific techniques that teachers use to manage classroom behavior, the researchers sampled 177 college students who were given the following directions: People try to get other people to do things they may not want to do. The other person usually thinks and often asks, "Why should I do this?" Give us the most common answers you'd give to this question, such as, 'It'll be good for you,' or 'You will lose a lot if you don't." The students generated over 2,500 messages. These messages were then coded into 150 categories. Since many of these

categories overlapped, the authors independently and jointly coded the messages and derived a list of 18 BATs, represented by behavior alteration messages (BAMs). Their typology overlaped with previously identified typologies, but was not identical to any of them.

In the second phase of their study, 204 elementary and secondary teachers were shown messages (BAMs) representing each BAT and were asked to indicate on 5-point scales how frequently they used each BAM to control study behavior and how effective these attempts were. Then, the teachers were asked to indicate how frequently and effectively students used similar statements on them. Finally, teachers were given a 4-item scale to measure their job satisfaction, and were asked how many years they had been teaching, the grade levels they usually taught, and their gender.

The teachers identified a list of seven BATs, as both frequently used and effective for classroom management:

(1) *Reward for behavior*. Teachers using this BAT attempt to elicit compliance by suggesting that new behaviors will be inherently rewarding.

(2) *Reward from source*. This is similar to French and Raven's (1968) reward power. Teachers using this BAT attempt to gain compliance through direct rewards.

(3) *Personal Responsibility*. Teachers attempting to gain compliance within this category stress that the class can not function properly without the student's unique abilities that no other student can provide.

(4) *Expert*. This is similar to French and Raven's (1968) notion of expert power. Teachers using this BAT rely on the student's perception that they are qualified to demand certain behaviors because of their expertise and superior knowledge.

(5) *Self-esteem*. Teachers using this BAT attempt to gain student compliance by positively reinforcing a student's sense of self-worth in relation to a given task.

(6) *Altruism*. Teachers who use this BAT attempt to elicit compliance by appealing to the student's commitment to other members of the class. Instead of focusing on a student's unique abilities, as in *personal responsibility*, this BAT s suggests that the other class members will be happier if the student complies.

(7) *Duty*. This is a combination of both *personal responsibility* and *altruism*. When using this

promotes team spirit.

The authors interpret these seven BATs in light of the previous research on power bases. The authors note that these seven BATs are primarily reward-type strategies and mainly rely on "student audience effects" to affect change. The BATs *reward for behavior, reward from source* and *self-esteem* all emphasize the positive consequences of compliance, in the tradtion of French and Raven's (1968) reward power. Similarly, the BAT *expert* corresponds with French & Raven's expert power base while the BATs *altruism*, *duty*, and *personal responsibility* correspond with referent power. A difference in these BATs and these power bases, is that the BATs target the class as the audience, instead of the targeting the teacher.

Additionally, this study found that teachers did not perceive that students employing BATs with them and when student's occasionally did, they were not effective. In addition, instructors' gender, years teaching, level of instruction, and satisfaction with teaching did not predict use of particular BATs.

The remainder of the articles in this series on power in the classroom are concerned with classroom management techniques. The BATs and associated messages are expanded and refined (Kearney, Plax, Richmond, & McCroskey, 1984) and linked to areas such as, cognitive and affective learning (e.g. McCroskey, Richmond, Plax, & Kearney, 1985; Plax, Kearney, McCroskey, & Richmond, 1986; Richmond, McCroskey, Kearney, & Plax, 1987). One of the articles in this series explored the relationship of control strategies to teacher immediacy.

Plax, Kearney, McCroskey, and Richmond (1986) examined the relationship among the BATs and BAMs, teacher immediacy and affective learning in *Power in the Classroom VI: Verbal Control Strategies, Nonverbal Immediacy, and Affective Learning*. The authors noted that an underlying assumption in teaching is that students must be disciplined and controlled in order to learn. However, the authors observed that too much rigid control over students may actually backfire and cause students to be more disruptive. They state that other, more constructive methods of classroom management are being sought that enable students to want to learn, rather than forcing them to learn. Some examples of these are motivational messages, structured transitions, positive questioning techniques, etc. Another approach to classroom management emphasizes the teachers use of power in eliciting student compliance. This power approach centers around teachers

authors noted that previous studies on the verbal control strategies (BATs/BAMs) have only focused on the effects of the verbal or content component in gaining student compliance. They stated that to encourage successfully on-task behaviors, teachers may need to be supplement with nonverbal behaviors that communicate positive affect. This study (Plax, Kearney, McCroskey, and Richmond, 1986) study attempted to examine the role of nonverbal immediacy in the use of verbal control strategies and students' affect for learning. The authors defined immediacy as "the extent to which particular behaviors enhance physical or psychological distance" (p. 45). Specific behaviors may include body lean, physical closeness, eye contact, smiling and touch.

The authors completed two studies that examined the effect of both the BATs and nonverbal immediacy on affective learning. The first study sampled junior high and senior high school students (student N = 620) and the second study sampled college students (student N = 1320). In both studies, participants completed the same three questionnaires. In the measure for the BATs, students were presented with 22 BAMs (the college students had an adapted questionairres that reflected messages more suitable to the college classroom) and were asked to indicate how frequently their teacher used the BAMs to change their classroom behavior. Students also filled out the Generalized Immediacy Scale developed by Anderson (1979) in which a description of immediacy was followed by two sets of semantic differential scales. Student affect was defined in terms of the Krathwohl, Bloom, and Masia (1956) learning taxonomy. Student affective learning was operationalized as students' attitudes to the course, subject matter and instructor, as well as engaging in behaviors taught in the class and taking additional classes in the subject matter.

The results indicated that nonverbal immediacy clearly mediates the effect of verbal messages. In fact, the authors concluded that, "student affect is primarily a function of perceptions of nonverbal immediacy" (p. 52). Additionally, positive student affect required both an immediate approach and selective use of verbal control strategies. Specifically, positive student affect was associated with verbal control strategies that were consistent with nonverbal immediacy. In this way, teacher immediacy goes hand-in-hand with reward-type, prosocial BATs. By the same token, nonimmediacy is related to antisocial BATs.

Another study (although not in this series) examined the effect of immediacy in the classroom (Kearney, Plax, Smith, & Sorenson, 1988). Instead of examining the effect of immediacy on learning, this study investigated the effects of immediacy and strategy type (BATs

and BAMs) on students' resistance to on-task demands. The authors noted that past research has demonstrated that students are more likely to comply with prosocial strategies than with antisocial strategies. However, the authors sought to determine whether or not teachers' perceived nonverbal immediacy mediated that effect since nonverbal behaviors provide interpretive cues to verbal behaviors. The authors take immediacy to mean the "physical or psychological closeness," whereas "nonimmediacy communicates avoidance, dislike, coldness, and interpersonal distance," (p. 55).

This study employed a 2 x 2 design that asked college students (N = 629) whether or not they would comply with an instructor in one of the following scenarios: An immediate teacher who used prosocial or antisocial BATs, or a nonimmediate teacher who used prosocial or antisocial strategies.

The results indicated that students would be more likely to comply with immediate teachers who use prosocial BATs than a nonimmediate teacher who employs antisocial BATs. In addition, nonimmediate teachers who use prosocial BATs to gain compliance are likely to be resisted since such attempts may be perceived as insincere. Nonimmediate teachers are resisted more than immediate teachers regardless whether or not they used prosocial or antisocial BATs, however. The authors conclude that teachers should work to establish nonverbal immediacy early so that students will be more likely to resist compliance gaining attempts. "Simply stated, students may be more willing to comply with teachers they like as opposed to teachers they don't" (p. 65.)

As the above quote suggests, the data indicated a relationship between liking of the teacher and students willingness to comply with instructor's demands. Note, however, that the authors imply the equivilency of immediacy and liking. Other literature conceives of liking as a much broader construct. This broader construct is called "affinity" and includes several variables, including immediacy. The next section of the present paper will explicate the concept of affinity and provide a rationale for examining how affinity relates to the five power bases identified by French and Raven (1968).

Affinity in the Classroom

McCroskey and Wheeless (1976) introduced the construct of "affinity" in the interpersonal context as "a positive attitude toward another person" (p. 231). The affinity construct includes perceptions of credibility, similarity, and attraction. They described seven techniques that could aid

in affinity development: controlling physical appearance, increasing positive self-disclosure, stressing areas of positive similarity, providing positive reinforcement, expressing cooperation, complying with another's wishes, and fulfilling other's needs.

Bell and Daly (1984) expanded on this work by introducing and explicating the concept of "affinity seeking." They defined "affinity seeking" as "the active social-communicative process by which individuals attempt to get others to like and feel positive toward them" (p. 91). They developed a typology of 25 affinity seeking techniques that can be used to generate liking. Bell and Daly concluded that these techniques are effective in generating affinity. They confined their concept of affinity seeking , however, to the interpersonal context.

McCroskey and McCroskey (1986) drew upon Bell and Daly's work to adapte affinity seeking construct to the classroom. McCroskey and McCroskey (1986) posited that effective communication was crucial in the classroom. Although a teacher presents material to the entire class, students learn individually, therefore, teaching must be viewed as an interpersonal communication process. In this study, McCroskey and McCroskey (1986) looked at how much each affinity-seeking strategy is used in elementary and high school and how frequently each strategy is used by elementary and secondary teachers.

To do this, McCroskey and McCroskey (1986) sampled 311 elementary and secondary teachers enrolled in instructional communication classes. Next, they adapted Bell and Daly's (1984) typology to the classroom setting by rewriting Bell and Daly's descriptions of each strategy (see appendix). McCroskey and McCroskey (1986) asked the subjects to indicate whether or not other teachers in their school used each specific strategy by circling either "yes" or "no," and how often other teachers in their school use the same strategy by circling either: rarely, occasionally, often, very often. Subjects were asked to focus on the affinity-seeking behavior of other teachers in order to reduce the social desirability of their answers.

McCroskey and McCroskey (1986) found that elementary and secondary school teachers relied on eight affinity seeking strategies primarily: physical attractiveness, sensitivity, elicit other's disclosure, trustworthiness, nonverbal immediacy, conversational rule-keeping, dynamism, and listening. College teachers were not a part of their sample, although they speculated that use of affinity seeking strategies would be a function of grade level taught.

McCroskey and McCroskey (1986) conceived of affinity as an influence strategy. They

wrote, "In the classroom environment, teachers regularly need to influence students to engage in on-task learning behaviors" (p. 158). "To the extent that a student has higher affinity (liking, positive regard) for his/her teacher, he/she is more likely to accept the teacher's influence and more likely to increase time spent learning tasks" (McCroskey & McCroskey, 1986, p. 159). However, this assumption that high teacher affinity leads to students' compliance is taken-for-granted and the focus of the study (McCroskey and McCroskey, 1986) was how frequently teachers used affinity seeking strategies, not whether or not affinity actually influenced students to comply with teachers.

Researchers have linked affinity-seeking to a variety of classroom benefits such as teacher credibility (Frymier & Thompson, 1992), classroom climate (Meyers, 1995), teacher competence (Prisbell, 1983) and student learning (Roach, 1991). However, the idea of affinity as a form of influence has received little attention. At best, it is a taken for granted assumption, as in the McCroskey and McCroskey study (1986).

Richmond (1990), comes closest to examining the relationship of affinity to power. She examined the effects of the power bases (French & Raven, 1968; McCroskey & Richmond, 1983), Behavior Alteration Techniques (BATs) (Kearney, Plax, Richmond, & McCroskey, 1985), teacher immediacy, and affinity seeking on the outcomes of student motivation, cognitive learning, and affective learning. Richmond found that affinity seeking was positively related to student motivation, cognitive learning, and affective learning. In particular, affinity seeking accounted for a larger portion of the variance than power bases, BAT use, or immediacy. Five strategies contributed most to motivation: facilitate enjoyment, assume equality, nonverbal immediacy, optimism, and self-concept formation. In addition, Richmond reported that both perceived use of immediacy and affinity seeking were more highly correlated with cognitive learning than the power bases or BATs, although all are related to cognitive learning. Finally, immediacy and affinity seeking were more highly related to affective learning than the power bases or BAT use, although overall relationships were modest. Richmond says,

> it is clear that the development of positive relationships between student and teachers is crucial. When such relationships are built, the availability of referent and expert power are much greater, thus opening many more communication options to the teacher for maintaining mundane control (p. 194).

Aside from the above quoted Richmond study, the present author could locate no published

research linking affinity with power and influence.

Daly and Kreiser (1992) discussed affinity as a technique for influencing students in the classroom. They conceptualize affinity, thus, as a form of power. They note that most of the research on affinity has ignored this dimension. They stated that referent power can affect student behavior and that "it is possible to conceive of the various affinity strategies as ways of operationalizing referent power" (p. 142). They briefly summarize research that links referent power to classroom outcomes like: students' positive affect toward class material and the instructor, desire to enroll in future classes with related content, motivation to study for that instructor's class, etc. However, they base their conceptualization that high affinity equals high referent power on common sense or intuition. In addition, as Richmond stated, a good student-teacher relationship may influence the expert power base as well as the referent power base. It seems reasonable to conclude that affinity may interact with any of French and Raven's (1968) power bases. Also, referent power and affinity may not be the same thing at all. It is possible to like someone without regarding them as powerful. Referent power, by its very nature, suggests power that is associated with liking. However, this is a particular kind of liking. Not all liking equals power. For example, a young teaching assistant may be very much liked by students, but, students may not regard the teaching assistant as having power. In fact, many teaching assistants report frustration over dealing with classroom disruptions (Roach, 1995).

The present research will examine the potential of affinity may relate to any one of the power bases to influence students' perceptions of teacher power. Again, a high degree of shared perceptions regarding teacher power between teacher and student is essential for classroom management. Teachers must be seen by students as being able to implement power (Kearney, Plax, Richmond, McCroskey, 1985) in order to keep students on-task and minimize disruption. No work has examined a relationship of affinity to the various power bases identified by French and Raven (1968). The present work proposes the following research question:

To what extent does teacher affinity for teacher relate to students' perceptions of teacher's power?

Methodology

The purpose of this pilot study was to test the validity and reliability of a survey instrument designed to measure students' perceptions of teacher's power and students' affinity for teacher.

Subjects

Respondents for this study were 30 students enrolled in two basic communication courses at a midsize public university in the Southeastern US. The sample size was 30. The researcher distibuted a survey that contained measures of affinity and power. Respondents were requested to to take the survey home and were asked to return them the following class period. Instrument

The survey was divided into three sections. The first section contained measures of students' perceived power of teacher. The second section contained measures of students' affinity for teacher. The final section contained a demographic questionnaire.

Measures of the power were operationalized in accordance with French and Raven's (1968) conceptualization of the power bases (i. e., reward, coercion, legitimate, expert, and referent. The following instructions appeared at the top of the instrument, "Instructors often ask students to do things they do not want to do. Students often ask themselves, "Why should I do this?" Below are possible reasons students have for doing (or not doing) what instructors ask. Think of instructor you have directly before this class. With that instructor in mind, circle the answer that best reflects your opinion: 1) strongly agree 2) agree 3) neither agree or disagree 4)disagree 5) strongly disagree." For each of the five subscales of power, there were six questions for a total of 30 items.

The affinity instrument contained nine measures, for convenience sake, instead of the usual 25 measures. The specific affinity-seeking items were chosen based on research done from Frymier (1994). Frymier noted that although the affinity-seeking typology developed by McCroskey and McCroskey (1986) for the instructional context is supposed to reflect liking, no research has actually correlated affinity with liking. She correlated each item on the affinity-seeking typology with a liking scale she developed and found three strategies to be most highly correlated with liking. These were: assume equality (r=.40), dynamism (r=.48), and facilitate enjoyment (r=.46). Six other strategies were also found to be predictive of liking: comfortable self (r=.32) concede control (r=.31), conversational rule-keeping (r=.33), elicit other's disclosure (r.=38), nonverbal immediacy (r=.38), and optimism (r=.34). Only those that Frymier found highly related to liking were used. Each of the affinity-seeking variables were measured with six items to increase reliability.

The liking instrument began with the following instructions: "Think of the same instructor as you did above. For each statement below, indicate whether or not the statement describes that

instructor by circling one of the five choices: i) strongly agree 2) agree 3) neither agree or disagree 4) disagree 5) strongly disagree." There were six questions for each of the nine subscales of affinity for a total of 54 questions.

A demographic questionnaire assessed age, school classification, sex, whether the student primarily attended public or private schools and one measure of authority. This question asked students to indicate how they felt about authority by circling (1) I strongly respect authority; (2) I respect authority; (3) I don't know; (4) I disrespect authority and (5) I strongly disrespect authority.

A panel of experts (i. e., three university professors in communication) looked over the completed survey and suggested no changes. Two pretests were given to determine the readability of the questions. Both subjects taking the pretests determined that the questions were easy to understand.

Procedure

Surveys were administered by the researcher, during class, to students who received extra credit for returing them the following class period. The students were made aware verbally and in the survey instructions to think of the instructor they had prior to their present class as they answered the survey items. They were assured anonymity and told they did not have to participate.

Results

After the survey data were collected, they were coded and analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), subprograms for factor analysis, reliability, and Pearson's Correlation. The conventional alpha level of .05 was selected as the signifigance level.

Factor analysis and reliability

Power section. There were originally five subscales of power with a thirty items. The factor analysis generated six factors of power. After analyzing the Eigenvalues, loadings, and items within the factors, the researcher determined that three factors made theoretical sense. The first was termed "Admiration" (Eignevalue, 9.49679). This factor had an alpha reliability of .8805. The researcher determined the following items with loadings:

1. I want to be like my instructor (.85143).
2. My instructor knows what is best for me (.84237).
3. My instructor's knowledge/skill is enough reason to ask certain things of me (.75072).

4. I will do what my instructor asks because of my friendship with the instructor (.72694).

5. My instructor makes requests based on his/her knowledge in this area (.67746).

6. I like my instructor (.63215).

The researcher labeled the second term "Coercion" (Eigenvalue, 5.69937). It contained the following items and their loadings. This factor had an alpha reliability of .8688.

1. I am required by the university to do what my instructor asks (.81105).

2. There are negative consequences if I do not do what my instructor asks (-.69963).

3. Students have no choice but to do what instructors ask (.58427).

4. My instructor will ensure that something bad will happen if I do not do what he/she says (.57915).

5. My instructor can not punish me if I do not do what he/she says (.93106). (This was reverse coded.)

6. There will be discipline is I do not do what my instructor asks (.72171).

The researcher labelled the third factor "Authority" (Eigenvalue 3.27410). The alpha reliability was .7158. It contained the following items and their loadings:

1. My instructor makes requests based on his/her experience in this area (.87532).

2. I will gain in the short term or long term if I do what my instructor asks (.80106).

3. My instructor has little authority in the classroom (.83454). (This question was reverse coded.)

4. My instructor is not knowledgeable/skilled in his/her field (.83454). (This question was reverse coded.)

5. Students do not have to do what instructors ask. (.72171) (This question was reverse coded.)

Affinity section. The factor analysis of this section yielded 11 factors. After looking at the Eigenvalues, loadings and specific items within the factors, the researcher labelled thedetermined that five factors that made theoretical sense.

The researcher labelled the first factor "enjoyable." The Eigenvalue for this factor was very strong at .13.77859. The alpha reliability for this item was .9531. Items and their loadings for the first factor are listed below:

1. My instructor is lively (. 93003).

2. My instructor tries to get students to speak-up in class (.89551).

3. My instructor looks like he/she is having a good time in class (.87531).

4. My instructor is enthusiastic (.85384).

5. My instructor lets students take charge of conversations in class (.84331).

6. My instructor likes students to speak-up (.83605).

7. My instructor smiles at students as a whole, not just individual students (.81101).

8. My instructor is polite (.80393).

9. My instructor makes class enjoyable (.65967).

10. My instructor tries to make class fun (.78063).

11. My instructor is cheerful (77041).

12. My instructor lets students take charge of conversations in class (.68685).

13. My instructor is boring (.66686). (This item is reverse coded.)

14. My instructor tells stories and jokes in class (.79794).

15. My instructor is uninteresting (.65779). (This item is reverse coded.)

The second factor of affinity was termed "Openness" (Eigenvalue, 8.08637). The alpha reliability for this factor was .8826. Below are the items and their loadings. All items were reverse coded.

1. My instructor does not like suggestions from students (.90746).

2. My instructor does not think comments are important (.84685).

3. My instructor does not smile (.76242).

4. My instructor tries to make students inadequate (.74094).

5. My instructor is cold (.71471).

6. My instructor seems tense in class (.67172).

The third factor of affinity was named "Confidence" (Eigenvalue, 6.24997). The alpha reliability for this factor was .8923. Specific items and their loadings are listed below:

1. My instructor provides clear, relevant answers to students' question (.90034).

2. My instructor looks toward the class as a whole while talking (.81818).

3. My instructor has a positive outlook (.73296).

4. My instructor is entertaining (.70129).

5. My instructor seems relaxed and at-ease (.65571).

6. My instructor does not try to make students feel inferior (.62387).

7. My instructor is optimistic (.52372).

The researacher labelled the fourth factor "Sensitive" (Eigenvalue, 5.18446). The alpha reliability for this factor was .8326. Below are the items of that factor and their loadings. All were reverse coded.

1. My instructor acts like he/she is better than students (.93032).

2. My instructor interrupts students (79662).

3. My instructor is negative (.68244).

The fifth factor of affinity was labeled "Caring" (Eignevalue, 4.31254). The alpha reliability for this factor was .7182. Below are the specific items for this factor and their loadings.

1. My instructor is indifferent (.83801). (This item was reverse coded.)

2. My instructor moves close to students while speaking (.73909).

3. My instructor appears comfortable with students (.69112).

Pearson correlations

Pearson product moment correlation co-efficients were computed to address the major research question of this study: *Does students' affinity for teacher relate to students' perceptions of teacher's power?*

The analyses yielded positive correlations between the variables of enjoyment and admiration (r=.5479), confidence and admiration (r=.6174). openness and authority (r=.6515) and enjoyment and coercion (r=.5334). These four correlations indicated a positive linear relationship between students' affinity for teacher and students' perceptions of teacher's power. Only one analysis yielded a correlation within the independent variable: Confidence was correlated with enjoyment (r=.4100).

To measure the overall correlation between affinity and power, the researcher combined the affinity factors into a general affinity score and the three power factors into a general power socre. Analysis revealed a significant correlation between the two general measures (r=.7675).

Discussion

These correlations suggest that students' affinity for their teacher is related to their perceptions of teacher's power. The purpose of this investigation was to pilot test the survey instrument. The results do offer directions toward future lines of research into power and affinity

in the classroom. Based on the statistics, the researcher concluded this instrument is readible and useful.

Because the pilot study found this survey usable, a sample size was calculated for use in a formal study to gather norming data for this instrument. The sample size would need to be 384.46 [n'=(p)(p-1)/(te/t-value)2=(.51)((1-.51)/(.05/1.96)2=384.46]. However, taking a 95% eligible response and 60% return rate into account, 679.49 [n'=n/(e)(r)=384.46/(.95)(.60)=674.49] surveys would need to be distributed.

In an effort to obtain norming data for this instrument, the survey would be administered to students taking a core course. Although it would be convenient to administer the survey to students taking a core course at one university, the surveys would be administered to students at several different colleges or universities to make the study more generalizable to the population of college students.

References

Bell, R. A., & Daly, J. A. (1984). The affinity-seeking function of communication. Communication Monographs, 51, 91-115.

Daly, J. A., & Kreiser, P. O. (1992). Affinity in the classroom. In V. P. Richmond, & J. C. McCroskey (Eds.), Power in the classroom (pp. 121-143). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

French, J. R. P., Jr., & Raven, B. (1968). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), Studies in social power (pp. 118-149). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Frymier, A. B. (1994). The use of affinity-seeking in producing liking and learning in the classroom. Journal of Applied Communication Research, 22, 87-105.

Frymier, A. B, & Thompson, C. A. (1992). Perceived teacher affinity-seeking in relation to perceived teacher credibility. Communication Education, 41, 388-399.

Kearney, P., Plax, T. G., Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1984). Power in the classroom IV: Alternatives to discipline. In R. N. Bostrom (Ed.)., Communication yearbook 8 (pp. 724-746.) Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Kearney, P., Plax, T. G., Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1985). Power in the Classroom III: Teacher communication techniques and messages. Communication Education, 34, 19-28.

Kearney, P., Plax, T. G., Smith, V. R., & Sorensen, G. (1988). Effects of teacher immediacy and strategy type on college student resistance to on-task demands. Communication Education, 37, 55-67.

McCroskey, J. C., & McCroskey, L. L. (1986). The affinity-seeking of classroom teachers. Communication Research Reports, 3, 158-167.

McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1983). Power in the classroom I: Teacher and student perceptions. Communication Education, 32, 175-184.

McCroskey, J. C., Richmond, V. P., Plax, T. G., & Kearney, P. (1985). Power in the classroom V: Behavior alteration techniques, communication training and learning. Communication Education, 34, 214-226.

McCroskey, J. C., & Wheeless, L. R. (1976). An introduction to human communication.

Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Meyers, S. A. (1995). Student perceptions of teacher affinity-seeking and classroom climate. Communication Research Reports, 12, 192-199.

Plax, T. G., Kearney, P., McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1986). Power in the classroom VI: Verbal control strategies, nonverbal immediacy, and affective learning. Communication Education, 35, 43-55.

Roach, K. D. (1991). The influence and effects of gender and status on university instructor affinity-seeking behavior. Southern Communication Journal, 57, 73-80.

Richmond, V. P. (1990). Communication in the classroom: Power and motivation. Communication Education, 39, 181-195.

Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1984). Power in the classroom II: Power in the classroom. Communication Education, 33, 125-136.

Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C., Kearney, P., & Plax, T. G. (1987). Power in the classroom VII: Linking behavior alteration techniques to cognitive learning. Communication Education, 36, 1-12.

Roach, D. K. (1995). Teaching assistants argumentativeness and perceptions of power use in the classroom. Communication Research Reports, 12, 94-103.

Part I:

Directions: Instructors often ask students to do things they do not want to do. Students often ask themselves, "Why should I do this?" Below are possible reasons students have for doing (or not doing) what instructors ask. Think of the instructor you have directly before this class. With that instructor in mind, circle the answer that best reflects your opinion.

1) strongly agree
2) agree
3) neither agree or disagree
4) disagree
5) strongly disagree

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Students are expected to do what instructors ask.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I will receive some type of reward if I do my best work for him/her.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Nothing bad will happen if I do not do what he/she says.	1	2	3	4	5
4. My instructor has the authority to make requests in class.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I will receive some benefits if I do what he/she says.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I dislike my instructor.	1	2	3	4	5
7. There are negative consequences if I do not do what my instructor says.	1	2	3	4	5
8. My instructor is not knowledgeable/skilled in his/her field.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Students do not have to do what instructors ask.	1	2	3	4	5
10. My instructor knows what is best for me.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I am required by the university to do what my instructor asks.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I want to be like my instructor.	1	2	3	4	5
13. My instructor can not punish me if I do not do what he/she says.	1	2	3	4	5

14. My instructor's knowledge/skill is enough reason to ask certain things of me.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I will be punished if I do not do what my instructor says.	1	2	3	4	5
16. My instructor will see that I am rewarded if I do well for him/her.	1	2	3	4	5
17. My instructor has little authority in the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
18. I want to please my instructor.	1	2	3	4	5
19. My instructor will ensure that something bad will happen if I do not do what he/she says.	1	2	3	4	5
20. I will not receive any benefits if I do not do what he/she asks.	1	2	3	4	5
21. My instructor makes requests based on his/her experience in this area.	1	2	3	4	5
22. I have no desire to please my instructor.	1	2	3	4	5
23. I will gain in the short or long term if I do what my instructor asks.	1	2	3	4	5
24. My instructor does not know what is best for students.	1	2	3	4	5
25. There will be discipline is I do not do what he/she says.	1	2	3	4	5
26. I will do what my instructor asks because of my friendship with the instructor.	1	2	3	4	5
27. Students have no choice but to do what instructors ask.	1	2	3	4	5
28. I like my instructor.	1	2	3	4	5
29. My instructor makes requests based on his/her knowledge in this area.	1	2	3	4	5
30. I will not get rewards if I do not do what my instructor says.	1	2	3	4	5

Part II:

Directions: Think of the same instructor as you did above. For each statement below, indicate whether or not the statement describes that instructor by circling one of five choices:

1) strongly agree
2) agree
3) neither agree or disagree
4) disagree
5) strongly disagree

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
31. My instructor makes class enjoyable.	1	2	3	4	5
32. My instructor is cheerful.	1	2	3	4	5
33. My instructor changes the topic too soon.	1	2	3	4	5
34. My instructor lets students makes some decisions.	1	2	3	4	5
35. My instructor is negative.	1	2	3	4	5
36. My instructor tries to get students to speak-up in class.	1	2	3	4	5
37. My instructor uses gestures while talking.	1	2	3	4	5
38. My instructor acts like he/she is better than students.	1	2	3	4	5
39. My instructor looks like he/she is having a good time in class.	1	2	3	4	5
40. My instructor is enthusiastic.	1	2	3	4	5
41. My instructor is polite.	1	2	3	4	5
42. My instructor likes students to speak-up in class.	1	2	3	4	5
43. My instructor lets students take charge of conversations in class.	1	2	3	4	5
44. My instructor interrupts students.	1	2	3	4	5
45. My instructor presents him or herself as an equal to students.	1	2	3	4	5
46. My instructor is lively.	1	2	3	4	5
47. My instructor seems apprehensive in class.	1	2	3	4	5
48. My instructor tells interesting stories or jokes in class.	1	2	3	4	5
49. My instructor looks toward the class as a whole while talking.	1	2	3	4	5
50. My instructor discourages class participation.	1	2	3	4	5
51. My instructor avoids interrupting students.	1	2	3	4	5

52. My instructor is domineering.	1	2	3	4	5
53. My instructor smiles smiles at the class as a whole, not just individual students.	1	2	3	4	5
54. My instructor is boring.	1	2	3	4	5
55. My instructor does not get easily distracted in class.	1	2	3	4	5
56. My instructor is uninteresting.	1	2	3	4	5
57. My instructor has a positive outlook.	1	2	3	4	5
58. My instructor avoids looking at students while talking.	1	2	3	4	5
59. My instructor is open to disagreement.	1	2	3	4	5
60. My instructor is cold.	1	2	3	4	5
61. My instructor does not try to make students feel inferior.	1	2	3	4	5
62. My instructor is outgoing.	1	2	3	4	5
63. My instructor is pleasant to be around.	1	2	3	4	5
64. My instructor does not think students' comments are important.	1	2	3	4	5
65. My instructor will occasionally give into students' requests.	1	2	3	4	5
66. My instructor seems tense in class.	1	2	3	4	5
67. My instructor can adapt what he/she says to a par icular student.	1	2	3	4	5
68. My instructor does not like suggestions from students.	1	2	3	4	5
69. My instructor is critical of self or others.	1	2	3	4	5
70. My instructor avoids "one-upping" students.	1	2	3	4	5
71. My instructor seems relaxed and at-ease.	1	2	3	4	5
72. My instructor does not smile.	1	2	3	4	5
73. My instructor provides clear, relevant answers to students' questions.	1	2	3	4	5
74. My instructor does not try to act superior to students.	1	2	3	4	5
75. My instructor avoids complaining about things.	1	2	3	4	5
76. My instructor inquires about students' feelings, opinions, views and so on.	1	2	3	4	5
77. My instructor is entertaining.	1	2	3	4	5
78. My instructor is indifferent.	1	2	3	4	5
79. My instructor appears comfortable with students.	1	2	3	4	5

80. My instructor is optimistic.	1	2	3	4	5
81. My instructor tries to make students feel inadequate.	1	2	3	4	5
82. My instructor tries to make class fun.	1	2	3	4	5
83. My instructor responds to students' comments in a positive way.	1	2	3	4	5
84. My instructor moves close to students while speaking.	1	2	3	4	5

Part III:
Demographics

85) Age: (Check one)

18-24 _____
25-35 _____
36-45 _____
46-55 _____
over 55 _____

86) Sex: (Check one)

Male _____
Female_____

87) Classification: (Check one)

Freshman _____
Sophmore _____
Junior _____
Senior _____

88) Grade (anticipated) in the instructor's class that you listed above: (Circle one)
A B C D F

89) Overall GPA (current or anticipated: (Check the closest one to GPA)
4.0_____ 3.5 _____ 3.0_____ 2.5_____ 2.0 (or below) _____

90) In elementary through high school, did you attend primarily: (Check one)
public schools _____ private schools_____

91) Circle the answer that most closely reflects your opinion:

1. I strongly respect authority.
2. I respect authority.
3. I don't know.
4. I disrespect authority.
5. I strongly disrespect authority.